United Nations A/C.2/64/SR.42

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
17 February 2010

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 11 December 2009, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Park In-kook ..... (Republic of Korea)

Contents

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 133: Programme planning (*continued*)

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

09-64435 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.40)

Draft resolution on international trade and development

1. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan) said that she was submitting draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.40 for action by the Committee on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

2. **The Chairperson** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

3. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan) asked which delegation had requested the recorded vote.

4. **The Chairperson** said that it had been requested by the delegation of the United States of America. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. He invited explanations of vote before the vote.

5. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that opening markets to trade across the globe could play an essential role in reducing poverty and hunger and sharing the benefits of growth. It had been hoped that during the current year the United Nations would send a unified, constructive message from all Member States to encourage an ambitious and balanced conclusion to the Doha Round of trade negotiations. States had been so close to consensus, yet, in the end, the current draft had impeded that. His delegation was deeply disappointed.

6. The text did not encourage a constructive basis for building a fair and inclusive trade dialogue. That was why the United States had requested a recorded vote and why it would vote against the resolution. Hope remained that the Second Committee would take positive steps in the future to ensure that the United Nations remained relevant and constructive on economic and development matters.

7. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.40.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Mexico, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Turkey.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.40 was adopted by 113 votes to 47, with 6 abstentions.*

9. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that consensus resolutions not only reflected the views of Member States, but

could also provide policy guidance to negotiators at the World Trade Organization (WTO). Developing countries were extremely disappointed over the failure to achieve agreement on the resolution for five successive years, not counting the previous year, when a procedural text had been adopted.

10. A draft resolution using agreed language had been submitted in good faith, in the expectation of reciprocity, but that had not happened. The proposals on core principles, such as the development component of the resolution, had been watered down or eroded. Partners had not shown the political will necessary for a development-oriented text. The original text represented the bare minimum which the Group of 77 and China could accept on such a sensitive and critical issue. The Group of 77 and China hoped that the messages contained in the draft resolution would facilitate a speedy conclusion to the relevant WTO negotiations, which preserved the interests of developing countries.

11. **Mr. Fries** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Montenegro; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the resolution was a missed opportunity. It was very disappointing that the progress achieved through great effort and over many hours during the informal consultations had been lost due to the decision of the Group of 77 and China to revert to its initial draft proposal, which was much the same as the one it had submitted for action in 2007 at the sixty-second session of the Assembly. Accordingly, the European Union would also stand by its 2007 position.

12. It was regrettable that it had not been possible to reach an agreement and send a consensual message on the value of the Doha Development Agenda negotiations for all WTO members and the benefits that all Member States, including developing countries, derived from open trade and the rules-based multilateral trading system. The importance of open trade flows and of resisting protectionist pressures could not be overemphasized.

13. However, the resolution reflected one-sided views of the relations between trading partners and the linkages between trade and development issues, failing to take into account that current major trading partners were not the same as those of 10 years earlier. The European Union could not accept several elements of the draft resolution, which, overall, was imbalanced.

14. The Doha Development Agenda remained the central priority of the European Union trade policy. The European Union remained committed to open markets, progressive trade liberalization and stronger multilateral rules as a trigger for growth and development in developing countries. All WTO members shared a responsibility in the current Doha Round and should contribute according to their means. Of course, developing countries should do less than developed countries.

15. At the same time, emerging economies should open their markets in order to increase South-South trade and in favour of the least developed countries. The Doha Development Agenda was not a one-way street.

16. The potential of the United Nations to contribute to the trade and development debate was not being fully tapped. In 2010, negotiators should start with a fresh text that would take into account the progress made during the current session's negotiations, in order to achieve different and more constructive results.

17. **Ms. Russo** (Canada), speaking on behalf of Australia, New Zealand and Canada (CANZ), expressed disappointment that no consensus had emerged from discussions on the draft resolution, especially at such an important juncture in the Doha Round. Regrettably, the resolution as initially proposed by the Group of 77 and China did not demonstrate the political will needed to break the Doha Round impasse.

18. The outcome did not reflect the flexibility, constructive spirit and efforts of various delegations during the debate on the issue. It was a missed opportunity for the Second Committee to add its important voice in sending a strong signal of support for bringing the current Doha Round to an ambitious and successful conclusion in 2010.

19. Consensus had been very close on a text that was traditionally voted upon. Unfortunately, however, the draft resolution as it stood worked against such efforts, which was why CANZ had voted against it. CANZ remained committed to a successful, development-oriented conclusion to the Doha Round. All members of the World Trade Organization were urged to demonstrate flexibility and political will in order to

work towards a balanced outcome acceptable to all WTO members.

20. **Mr. Stenvold** (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution, as it had two years earlier. As the facilitator of the informal negotiations on the resolution and as a former WTO negotiator, he had been quite aware of the difficulties. Nonetheless, consensus had been hoped for and even expected.

21. While the world was facing the most severe economic and financial crisis in generations, leading to significant reductions in global trade and to worrisome protectionist tendencies, key players had re-engaged in multilateralism, and the World Trade Organization had proved its value as a bulwark against beggar-thy-neighbour policies. Hence, at the start of the negotiations, the common goal had been to enable the United Nations to speak in a unified voice on international trade and development, for the first time in years. That could have provided much-needed support to the Doha Development Agenda.

22. Thanks to the constructive engagement of delegations, that goal had almost been reached. All delegations had shown flexibility until the very last informals. The only question which remained was to determine how the United Nations should respond to the very welcome fact that an increasing number of developing countries were now important or even dominant players in global trade and the world economy. In other words, the question was how to bridge the growing gap between old-school rhetoric and current realities.

23. Speaking in his personal capacity as facilitator, he believed that until a reasonable answer was found to that essential question, the United Nations would remain less than relevant on key issues of global economic governance. That was deeply regrettable.

24. **Mr. Fazal** (Singapore) said that while his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, it wished to state for the record its strong preference for a consensus resolution. Such a resolution would have been timely and would have demonstrated a common commitment to the conclusion of the Doha Round, building on the political commitment achieved thus far. The informal negotiations should not be regarded as a waste of effort but as providing a new point of departure for future negotiations.

25. **Mr. Murakami** (Japan) said that due to the deep contraction of international trade caused by the crisis, there was a pressing need for capacity-building and new infrastructure support for trade in developing countries. Japan had been actively implementing Aid for Trade. In July, it had announced a new initiative to assist the most vulnerable countries.

26. It was important for the Second Committee to send a unified message from all Member States about the importance of Aid for Trade and the fight against protectionism. It was therefore regrettable that consensus had not been reached.

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.19 and non-paper)

Draft resolutions on the international financial system and development

27. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on a draft resolution contained in an informal paper ("non-paper") in English only, which had been submitted by the Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, Mr. García González, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.19. It contained no programme budget implications.

28. **Mr. García González** (El Salvador), Vice-Chairperson, said that the eighth preambular paragraph, which was missing from the draft, should read as follows: "*Recognizing* the substantive discussions and efforts taken at the national, regional and international level in response to the world financial and economic crisis". The current paragraph 14, about capital flows, should be placed after paragraph 4. Paragraph 13 should begin, "*Notes in this regard* ...". In the first line of paragraph 16-17, the acronym "SDR" should be spelled out as "special drawing rights", and in the third line, "SG" should be spelled out as "Secretary-General". The final clause of paragraph 16-17 should read, "While preparing his report on the implementation of the present resolution ..." to make it consistent with paragraph 21 and avoid confusion.

29. *The draft resolution contained in the informal paper ("non-paper") submitted by the Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on the basis of informal negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.19, as orally revised, was adopted.*

30. **Mr. Escalona Ojeda** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the unity of the Group of 77 and China had been very important in achieving a balanced resolution. That would be useful to the work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group established under General Assembly resolution 63/305. The unity of the Group of 77 and China was also extremely valuable for the independence and liberation of the peoples it represented. It was his delegation's wish that that unity, based on peace and justice, should extend to all.

31. While the resolution was a good one, it was too bad that it did not go further in protecting the interests of the weakest and most vulnerable, who were hard hit by a crisis for which they were not responsible. Additional clarity would have been appreciated on the important role of the United Nations as the most democratic and inclusive organization, which brought all peoples together and placed them on an equal footing. His delegation supported the creation of regional and interest groups, but none should surpass the status of the United Nations.

32. The causes of the crises, which were systemic and structural, and the responsibility of the Bretton Woods institutions and their conditionalities should be clearly defined. A clear statement on the use of special drawing rights for the purpose of development was needed, as well as a clear reference to correcting imbalances in voting and representation in the governance structure of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). His delegation endorsed the Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four on International Monetary Affairs and Development Communiqué made at its eighty-second meeting held in Istanbul, Turkey in October 2009, in which the ministers said that a political commitment to shift 7 per cent of aggregate quota shares from developed to developing countries should be a central goal of the next quota review. That should not happen at the expense of other developing countries. Deficiencies and bias against developing countries must be borne in mind, and the potential need for IMF resources must be inadequately reflected.

33. **Mr. Fries** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union was not satisfied with the content of the resolution, although it had joined the consensus. The resolution should have acknowledged more clearly the progress made in responding to the financial and economic crisis and the role of the Group of Twenty (G-20) in that regard. In addition, the reforms to the international financial institutions should have been mentioned in a more positive manner, as they had been in other General Assembly documents, including the Outcome of the United Nations Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development, held in June 2009.

34. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution highlighted the challenges faced and progress achieved since June 2009 in mitigating the impact of the financial crisis on developing countries. There should be closer cooperation between the United Nations system and other international organizations, including the Bretton Woods institutions, in order to advance the core development mandate of the United Nations. However, dialogue must reflect the different mandates and responsibilities of organizations. The United States did not believe that the resolution endorsed a formal role for the United Nations in decisions affecting the architecture of the international financial institutions. The United Nations was not the best forum for meaningful discussion on reform of the international monetary system, and it was regrettable that the resolution did not refer more explicitly to work being done by IMF and the G-20. The United States did not condone the use of capital controls, and their efficacy should not be assumed. They should be used only as a last resort and on a temporary basis, to provide breathing space for more comprehensive reform and in accordance with existing agreements.

35. At the G-20 Summit in London in April 2009, leaders had supported a general special drawing rights allocation of $250 billion to help stop a serious capital drain and contagion risk facing emerging market countries. It had been an exceptional measure at the height of the crisis. The role of special drawing rights raised complex considerations and there was little consensus on the issue. It should be stressed that decisions on special drawing rights were within the sole purview of IMF.

36. **Mr. González Segura** (Mexico) said that the economic and financial crisis required a coordinated response, particularly in regard to development challenges. Hence, the international financial system must be regulated and overseen. The emerging economies and developing countries must, therefore, take an appropriate role in reform of the international financial system, to make it inclusive and reflective of

changing realities and balances in the international economy.

37. His country participated in a number of forums and dialogues aimed at promoting a coordinated, effective response to the crisis by the international community. Among those forums, the G-20 deserved special recognition for its ability to mobilize its participants. It was, therefore, regrettable that the resolution did not mention the work of that influential group, or of other high-level dialogues, including at the regional and subregional level.

38. Moreover, it would have been useful for the resolution to invite the Secretary-General to share information with Member States and seek their opinions in determining a coordinated response to the crisis by the United Nations system.

39. **Ms. Flanagan** (Canada) said that several paragraphs in the resolution delved into matters internal to the international financial institutions. Those institutions had distinct governance structures responsible for oversight of their policies and decision-making. Reform processes were taking place independently in accordance with the mandates of those institutions.

40. It was disappointing that the efforts of the G-20 had not been acknowledged more concretely in the resolution. Efforts in the Second Committee should seek to complement the ongoing international response and be focused on the comparative advantage and expertise of the United Nations development system, rather than on issues outside the mandate of the United Nations.

41. **Ms. Sánchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) said that her delegation lamented the fact that on many matters it had been necessary to resort to agreed language, resulting in a resolution containing little that was new. Furthermore, the final working draft on which the informal paper was based had omitted references to the causes of the crisis, which had been set out in a proposal submitted by the Group of 77 and China. That text had consisted of language agreed to in the Outcome of the Conference on the Crisis, but it had been used by some groups during late-night negotiations as a bargaining chip to obtain what they had not achieved earlier in the negotiations. There had been no willingness to recognize the work done in other regional and subregional organizations which reflected the needs of countries of the South. The African Union, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) had done important work to respond to the crisis, and it was unfortunate that the text contained no mention of that.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.19 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 52: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.28)

Draft resolution on modalities for the fourth High-level Dialogue on Financing for Development

43. **Mr. González Segura** (Mexico), who had served as facilitator for draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.28, said that the modalities agreed upon for the event would encourage exploration of the links between the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Declaration, heightening interest and raising participation levels. Unfortunately, the event could not take place during the dates set in September 2009 by the General Assembly, and it had been necessary for the Assembly to postpone the event. Although there had been an understanding that the new dates would be determined no later than 11 December 2009, that had not been possible due to the efforts devoted to other necessary consultations. As soon as the dates for the event could be set, his delegation intended to submit the same draft resolution for adoption in the plenary Assembly.

44. **The Chairperson** said that no action would be taken on the draft resolution.

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.36 and L.71)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

45. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out an oral statement on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.71, said that provisions for the Conference of Parties and its subsidiary bodies had been made in the draft biennial calendar of conferences and meetings

for the biennium 2010-2011. Any incremental travel costs would be covered by the substantive secretariat, and additional meetings not included in the calendar would be funded through extrabudgetary resources. Therefore, adoption of the resolution would not entail additional requirements to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

46. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, said that in the last line of the final preambular paragraph, the words "the third quarter of" should be replaced by "autumn", so that it read "in autumn 2011".

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.71, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.36 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.37, L.64 and L.72)

Draft resolutions on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

49. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.64, which was being submitted by Mr. Diallo (Guinea), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.37. The programme budget implications of the draft proposal were contained in document A/C.2/64/L.72.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.64 was adopted.*

51. **Mr. González Segura** (Mexico) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus reflected growing international recognition of anti-corruption mechanisms such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption signed in his country in 2003. The adoption of the review mechanism for the implementation of the Convention had been one of the most significant achievements of the third session of the Conference of the States Parties, in which Mexico had actively participated. Recognizing, however, that many countries had not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention, his delegation attached particular importance to the draft resolution just adopted.

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.37 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (A/C.2/64/L.25 and L.59) (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

53. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.59, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.25. The programme budget implications of the draft proposal were contained in document A/C.2/64/L.74.

54. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, said that at the end of paragraph 20 (a) of the French text of the resolution, the word "de" should be replaced by "du". Paragraph 20 (a) would then read: "... et de l'élimination de la pauvreté et le cadre institutionnel du développement durable;". Paragraph 25 (c) of the English text had been changed to read as follows: "The third and final meeting of the Preparatory Committee will be held in Brazil in 2012 for three days to discuss the outcome of the Conference, immediately preceding the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, which will also be held for three days; in this regard, the Commission will postpone its multi-year programme of work for one year;".

55. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.59, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

56. **Ms. Pessôa** (Brazil) said that the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, which was to be hosted by her Government in 2012, might well be the last opportunity to make meaningful progress towards sustainable development goals before it was too late.

57. **Ms. Loza** (Nicaragua) said that the concept of "green economy" referred to in paragraph 20 (a) of the resolution had not been agreed upon intergovernmentally, and the definition of that concept should be a focus of the planned 2012 Conference on Sustainable Development.

58. **Mr. Purnama** (Indonesia) said that the resolution would strengthen the foundation for a sustainable development agenda in the United Nations system.

59. **Mr. Escalona Ojeda** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the environmental crisis was the product of a capitalist system that viewed nature and human beings as mere resources to be exploited for production. That world view was what was blocking agreement on emissions cuts and technology transfer in the run-up to the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference. The concept of a "green economy" should be approached within a framework of sustainable development and poverty eradication. It was not enough just to paint the same old predatory economic activities green. There needed to be a paradigm shift that made equality, justice and the environment priorities in the global economic system.

60. **Mr. Ström** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union looked forward to working with other Member States at the 2012 Conference and in other forums to address the themes of the green economy and the institutional framework for sustainable development. It would be important to consult with the Fifth Committee on the statement of programme budget implications.

61. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.73)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly

62. **The Chairperson** drew attention to the Committee's draft programme of work for the sixty-fifth session (A/C.2/64/L.73).

63. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that sub-item 7 (d) of the draft programme of work should be deleted. Item 7 would then have only three sub-items, (a), (b) and (c).

64. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly was adopted as orally corrected.*

Draft oral decision on rotation of the post of Rapporteur of the Second Committee

65. **The Chairperson** drew attention to the draft oral decision on rotation of the post of Rapporteur of the Second Committee, which had no programme budget implications.

66. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the following draft oral decision on rotation of the post of Rapporteur of the Second Committee:

> "The General Assembly decides that in order to rationalize further its methods of work for subsequent sessions of the General Assembly, the Second Committee should endeavour to elect its Rapporteur on the basis of his/her experience and personal competence and on the basis of rotation among the regional groups as follows: African States, Asian States, Eastern European States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and Other States."

67. *The draft oral decision on rotation of the post of Rapporteur of the Second Committee was adopted.*

Agenda item 133: Programme planning (*continued*)

68. **The Chairperson** informed the Committee that he had been advised by the Secretariat that there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention or action under that agenda item. He took it that the Committee decided that no action was required under that agenda item.

69. *It was so decided.*

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

70. **The Chairperson**, in his closing remarks, thanked all delegations, and in particular the Vice-Chairpersons, the Rapporteur of the Committee, the facilitators of the draft resolutions and the members of the Secretariat. The Committee had had a productive session, and the special events had proven particularly beneficial and stimulating. He appreciated the active participation of all delegations in those special events, and their creativity in proposing such themes as "Legal empowerment of the poor" and "Global social protection floor".

71. He was pleased that the Committee had managed to conclude its work in time to send its message to the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. He expressed gratitude to those Committee members who had worked late into the night to achieve consensus on some difficult issues. Among the draft resolutions adopted, he wished to highlight those on the implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty; and the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus and the outcome of the 2008 Review Conference.

72. He would convey to his successor several suggestions for improving the Committee's work methods, including maximizing use of the time allotted to the Committee by the Organization's conference services and minimizing duplication of statements in the general debate and the debate under individual agenda items. Consideration should also be given to instituting a one-time deadline for the submission of all draft proposals, reviewing current submission practices to enhance the efficiency of the negotiation process, and beginning the work of the Bureau as early as June or early July.

73. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that while the vast majority of the Committee's decisions had been reached by consensus and a unified message had ultimately been sent to the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference, it was nonetheless troubling that fissures remained on issues surrounding global trade and the Doha Round. Processes outside the United Nations, while important, were not a substitute for the multilateral forum provided by the United Nations to promote global partnerships for development.

74. **Mr. Fries** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that despite the adoption of a number of important resolutions, the European Union was concerned that the Committee's 2009 session had been unusually difficult and contentious. He agreed that it would be useful to review the Committee's working methods and looked forward to discussing the Chairperson's suggestions with other members.

75. **Mr. Seth** (Director, Office for Economic and Social Council Support and Coordination), said that delegates should not get so caught up in the day-to-day difficulties of negotiating resolutions that they lost sight of the larger significance of the total body of work they had accomplished during the session.

76. **The Chairperson** expressed the hope that in preparation for the following year's session the delegates would take into consideration the ways in which disharmony on the Committee detracted from the ability of the United Nations to carry out its unique tasks. He declared that the Committee had completed the main part of its work for the sixty-fourth session.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.